REMARKS

Claims 1 – 9 and 14 – 20 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application, and Claims 10 – 13 were previously cancelled.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 – 20 were rejected. No claim amendment has been entered in this paper.

Accordingly, Claims 1 – 9 and 14 – 20 remain at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims1-13 and 19-20

Claims 1-13 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boltz et al. ("*Boltz*") (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,731) in view of Corrigan et al. ("*Corrigan*") (U.S. Patent No. 6,640,097). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to an information processing system which comprises a first information processing apparatus, a second information processing apparatus, and-a third information processing apparatus.

In a relevant part, Claim 1 requires that the third information processing apparatus sends the authentication screen information to the first information processing apparatus, determines whether the authentication information received from first information processing apparatus satisfies a predetermined input format, and based on a satisfactory determination selects the second information processing apparatus corresponding to the predetermined area information obtained from the first information processing apparatus and sends the authentication information obtained from the first information processing apparatus to the selected second information processing apparatus via the network, and based on a non-satisfactory determination resends the authentication screen information to the first information processing apparatus,

That is, the third information processing apparatus determines that the information input the first information processing unit satisfies a predetermined input format prior to sending this information to the second information processing apparatus. In other words, the third information processing apparatus checks the authentication information by determining whether a specified number of characters is entered in the screen before sending the authentication information to the second information processing apparatus.

This prior-to-sending checking process provides an advantage in that it reduces redundant and/or repeated communication between the third information processing apparatus and the

second information processing apparatus because the information sending is performed only after the authentication information is determined to satisfy a predetermined format.

This is clearly unlike *Boltz* and *Corrigan,* taken singly or in combination with each other. The Examiner acknowledged that *Boltz* fails to disclose that the third information processing apparatus sends the authentication screen information to the first information processing apparatus and determines whether the authentication information received from first information processing apparatus satisfies a predetermined input format, but asserted that *Corrigan* allegedly does and pointed to FIG. 3 and column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 8 for support.

However, *Corrigan* states in the disclosure section selected by the Examiner that (emphasis added):

> "The node 1 also interfaces on the Internet side with a WAP gateway, and signaling sequences are illustrated in FIG. 3. *A mobile user service request reaches the node as a URL request in http format, and the node presents a login screen. The user inputs access security codes and the node interfaces on the Internet side to have the required content delivered in HTML format and relayed to the user in WML format.* This is a full request, but the node also handles push data transfers. Indeed an important aspect to the node is that it provides a variety of services as required by users in a versatile manner."

That is, in *Corrigan,* the node 1 presents a login screen (authentication screen), receives authentication information and sends the request to the Web server in an HTML format, but does not determine whether authentication information was entered in a predetermined input format, as required by Claim 1.

As such, Claim 1 is patentable over *Boltz* and *Corrigan,* taken singly or in combination with each other, as are dependent Claims 1 – 4, for at least the same reasons.

1-13 and 19-20

Independent Claims 5, 9, 14, 18 and 19, which also recite the same distinguishable limitation at that of Claim 1, are also patentable over *Boltz* and *Corrigan,* taken singly or in combination with each other, as are their corresponding dependent Claims for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 14-18

Claims 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higuchi et al. ("*Higuchi*") (U.S. Publication No. 2003-0050050) in view of *Corrigan*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 14 and 18 recite the same distinguishable limitation as that of Claim 1, discussed above.

As stated above, in *Corrigan*, the node 1 presents a login screen (authentication screen), receives authentication information and sends the request to the Web server in an HTML format, but does not determine whether authentication information was entered in a predetermined input format, as required by Claim 1. Moreover, as admitted by the Examiner, *Higuchi* also fails to teach or suggest this distinguishable limitation. As such, Claims 14 and 18 are patentable over *Higuchi* and *Corrigan,* taken singly or in combination with each other, as are their dependent Claims, if any, for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1 – 9 and 14 – 20 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Jan. 4, 2008 By: David R. Metzger

David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000